



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/655,387

04/06/2004

Peter V. Radatti

E-2557

7299

7590

10/08/2009

CyberSoft, Inc.
Suite 101
1958 Butler Pike
Conshohocken, PA 19428-1202

EXAMINER

PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2437

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/08/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/655,387	Applicant(s) RADATTI, PETER V.	
	Examiner MICHAEL PYZOSHA	Art Unit 2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-37 are pending.
2. Response filed 08/20/2009 has been received and considered.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 9, 11 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities: each of these claims recites the phrase "on top the transport layer" when it should read "on top of the transport layer". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 11, 18-19, 21-25, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al (US 6088803) in view of Engel et al. (US 6115393).

As per claims 1, 3, 11, 18, 34, and 36, Tso et al discloses an apparatus and method including a protocol parser; a protocol scanner; and, a proscribed code scanner comprised of a scanning means and an indicator whereby said protocol parser intercepts instant messaging or peer-to-peer code on a communications channel and transmits said code to said proscribed code scanner through said protocol scanner (see

column 6 lines 10-24 where the parser performs the functions the protocol parser and the transcode service providers perform the function of the protocol scanner).

Tso et al. fails to explicitly disclose the protocol parser is capable of discriminating among different protocols implemented on top of the transport layer.

However, Engel et al. teaches a protocol parser that discriminates between different protocols implemented on top of the transport layer (see column 19 line 53 through column 20 line 28 and FIG 2 and 19).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the protocol parser of Engel et al. as the parser of the Tso et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow statistics, state tracking and tracing operations to be performed (see Engel et al. column 19 lines 35-63).

As per claims 2 and 19, the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system discloses a translation means whereby said translation means translates said code to authorized program parameters (see Tso et al. column 6 lines 10-24 and Engel et al. column 19 line 53 through column 20 line 28).

As per claim 4, 6, 23, the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system discloses the proscribed code scanner further comprises a scanning means and an indicator means and provide an indication of the presence is scanning finds proscribed code (see Tso et al. column 3 lines 39-54).

As per claims 7 and 25, the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system discloses the proscribed code scanner comprises a malicious code scanner (see Tso et al. column 3 lines 39-54).

As per claims 8, 10, and 24, the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system discloses the protocol parser further comprises a configuration means for configuring interception parameters (see Tso et al. column 6 lines 10-24 and column 5 lines 27-43).

As per claims 21-22, the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system discloses returning said code to a communication channel if said indicator is negative (see Tso et al. column 3 lines 55-65).

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system as applied above, and further in view of Corliss (US 6771949).

As per claim 9, the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system discloses an apparatus for processing code comprising: a protocol parser capable of discriminating among different protocols implemented on top of the transport layer (see Tso et al. column 6 lines 10-24 and Engel et al. column 19 line 53 through column 20 line 28) and, a proscribed code scanner; whereby said protocol parser intercepts messaging code on a communications channel and transmits said code for review by said proscribed code scanner and said protocol parser being provided to parse protocols on top the transport layer (see Tso et al. column 6 lines 10-24 and Engel et al. column 19 line 53 through column 20 line 28).

The modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system discloses intercepting codes that are commonly passed over the Internet (see Engel et al. column 19 line 53 through column 20 line 28), but fails to explicitly disclose that the messaging code is short messaging code.

However, Corliss teaches sending short messages (SMS) over the internet (see column 3 line 57 through column 4 line 3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system to intercept short messaging code.

Motivation, as recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art, to do so would have been to monitor SMS messages.

7. Claims 5, 12, 15-17, 20, 26-29, 32-33, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system as applied to claims 1 and 18 above, and further in view of Johnson (US 5682428).

As per claims 12, 17, 26, and 35, the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system fails to disclose decrypting the code.

However, Johnson discloses decrypting data (see column 27 lines 23-56).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Johnson's method of decryption in the modified Tso et al. and Engel et al. system of code scanning.

Motivation to do so would have been to be able to reference and manipulate previously encrypted data (see Johnson column 27 lines 23-56).

As per claims 5 and 20, the modified Tso et al., Engel et al. and Johnson system discloses a certification means (see Johnson column 24 line 52 through column 25 line 8).

As per claims 15-16, 27-29, and 32, the modified Tso et al., Engel et al. and Johnson system discloses encrypting the code if the indication of a prescribed code is negative (see Johnson column 27 lines 23-56).

As per claim 33, the modified Tso et al., Engel et al. and Johnson system discloses a separate system inserted in said communications channel, and with at least one of said steps of intercepting said code; decrypting said code; scanning said code for the presence of proscribed code, and providing an indicator for the presence of said proscribed code, occurring on said separate machine (see Tso et al and Johnson as applied to previous claims).

8. Claims 13-14 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Tso et al., Engel et al. and Johnson system as applied to claims 12 and 26 above, and further in view of Elgamal et al (US 6389534).

As per claims 13-14 and 30-31 the modified Tso et al., Engel et al. and Johnson system fails to disclose the use of SSL or S/MIME encryption.

However, Elgamal et al discloses the use of these encryption techniques (see column 4 lines 15-29).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Elgamal et al's methods of encryption to perform the encryption of the modified Tso et al., Engel et al. and Johnson system.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for the encryption suitable for each market (see Elgamal et al column 4 lines 15-29).

9. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Tso et al., Engel et al. and Johnson system as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Cogger et al. (US 20020087383).

As per claim 37, the modified Tso et al., Engel et al. and Johnson system fails to disclose intercepting with said parser a request from one or the other of an original client and an original server for an SSL transfer, creating with said parser a new SSL server that communicates with said client and a new SSL client that communicated with said server, and intercepting with said SSL client and said SSL server communications that occur between said original client and said original server.

However, Cogger et al. teaches such intercepting, decrypting and re-encrypting using SSL (see paragraph [0060]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the steps of Cogger et al. in the modified Tso et al., Engel et al. and Johnson system.

Motivation to do so would have been to verify a users session (see Cogger et al. paragraph [0060]).

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory

Art Unit: 2437

obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 15-29 and 32-36 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S.

Patent No. 7389540 in view of Engel et al.

The claims of '540 contain limitations of claims 1-8, 10-12, 15-19 and 32-36, but fail to explicitly disclose the protocol parser is capable of discriminating among different protocols implemented on top of the transport layer that intercepts instant messaging code.

However, Engel et al. teaches a protocol parser that discriminates between different protocols implemented on top of the transport layer (see column 19 line 53 through column 20 line 28 and FIG 2 and 19).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the protocol parser of Engel et al. as the parser of the '540 claims.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow statistics, state tracking and tracing operations to be performed (see Engel et al. column 19 lines 35-63).

11. Claim 9 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 7389540 in view of Moore et al. as applied above and further in view of Corliss.

As per claim 9, the modified claims in view of Moore et al. teach intercepting codes that are commonly passed over the Internet (see Engel et al. column 19 line 53 through column 20 line 28), but fails to explicitly disclose that the messaging code is short messaging code.

However, Corliss teaches sending short messages (SMS) over the internet (see column 3 line 57 through column 4 line 3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the modified system of the '540 claims in view of Engel et al. to intercept short messaging code.

Motivation, as recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art, to do so would have been to monitor SMS messages.

12. Claims 13, 14, 30 and 31 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 7389540 in view of Moore et al. as applied above and further in view of Elgamal.

As per claims 13-14 and 30-31 the modified claims in view of Engel et al. fail to disclose the use of SSL or S/MIME encryption.

However, Elgamal et al discloses the use of these encryption techniques (see column 4 lines 15-29).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Elgamal et al's methods of encryption to perform the encryption of the modified claims in view of Engel et al.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow for the encryption suitable for each market (see Elgamal et al column 4 lines 15-29).

13. Claim 37 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 7389540 in view of Engel et al. and Elgamal as applied above and further in view of Cogger et al.

As per claim 37, the modified claims in view of Engel et al. and Elgamal system fails to disclose intercepting with said parser a request from one or the other of an original client and an original server for an SSL transfer, creating with said parser a new SSL server that communicates with said client and a new SSL client that communicated with said server, and intercepting with said SSL client and said SSL server communications that occur between said original client and said original server.

However, Cogger et al. teaches such intercepting, decrypting and re-encrypting using SSL (see paragraph [0060]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the steps of Cogger et al. in the modified system of the claims in view of Engel et al. and Elgamal.

Motivation to do so would have been to verify a users session (see Cogger et al. paragraph [0060]).

14. Claims 1-8 and 10-36 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7404212 in view of Engel et al.

The claims of '212 contain the limitations of claims 1-8 and 10-36, but fail to explicitly disclose the protocol parser is capable of discriminating among different protocols implemented on top of the transport layer that intercepts instant messaging code.

However, Engel et al. teaches a protocol parser that discriminates between different protocols implemented on top of the transport layer (see column 19 line 53 through column 20 line 28 and FIG 2 and 19).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the protocol parser of Engel et al. as the parser of the '540 claims.

Motivation to do so would have been to allow statistics, state tracking and tracing operations to be performed (see Engel et al. column 19 lines 35-63).

15. Claim 9 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7404212 in view of Moore et al. as applied above and further in view of Corliss.

As per claim 9, the modified claims in view of Moore et al. teach intercepting codes that are commonly passed over the Internet (see Engel et al. column 19 line 53 through column 20 line 28), but fails to explicitly disclose that the messaging code is short messaging code.

However, Corliss teaches sending short messages (SMS) over the internet (see column 3 line 57 through column 4 line 3).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for the modified system of the '212 claims in view of Engel et al. to intercept short messaging code.

Motivation, as recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art, to do so would have been to monitor SMS messages.

Motivation, as recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art, to do so would have been to monitor SMS messages.

16. Claim 37 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No. 7404212 in view of Engel et al. and Elgamal as applied above and further in view of Cogger et al.

As per claim 37, the modified claims in view of Engel et al. and Elgamal system fails to disclose intercepting with said parser a request from one or the other of an original client and an original server for an SSL transfer, creating with said parser a new SSL server that communicates with said client and a new SSL client that communicated with said server, and intercepting with said SSL client and said SSL server communications that occur between said original client and said original server.

However, Cogger et al. teaches such intercepting, decrypting and re-encrypting using SSL (see paragraph [0060]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform the steps of Cogger et al. in the modified system of the claims in view of Engel et al. and Elgamal.

Motivation to do so would have been to verify a user's session (see Cogger et al. paragraph [0060]).

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments filed 08/20/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues (see pages 10-17) that the combination of Tso and Engel fail to teach the claimed limitations and it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references; Applicant traverses the further combination with Corliss (see pages 18-19), Johnson (see pages 19-20), Elgamal (see pages 20-21), Cogger (see pages 21-22) and Applicant traverses the double patenting rejections (see pages 23-25).

With respect to Applicant's argument (see page 12) that Tso fails to disclose using a parser to parse protocols on top of the transport layer, Tso was not relied upon for teaching this limitation.

Applicant further argues (see page 13) that Tso works between a network client and the network and therefore does not teach the claimed communication channel, however, Tso is a system for checking network data for viruses. The network connection made by the client creates a channel where data (i.e. communications) is

transferred. Therefore, the network of Tso teaches the claimed "communications channel".

Applicant argues (see page 14) that Engel discloses user selected protocols and not the claimed protocol parser, however, Engel teaches a Real Time Parser (RTP) which is "a collection of routines which perform protocol parsing" (see column 19 lines 53-54). It is clear that Engel teaches a protocol parser and this parser has various routines for "parsing the different protocols at the various layers" (see column 20 lines 1-3) many of these protocols are implemented at levels above the transport layer (see column 20 lines 4-28). Therefore, Engel teaches "a protocol parser capable of discriminating among different protocols implemented on top of the transport layer".

Applicant argues (see page 15) that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Tso because Tso is not related to streams and therefore does not support a modification to the claimed invention and that the combination is based on hindsight. With respect to this argument it is noted that streams are not claimed; although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir.1993). In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a

reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant argues (see page 16) that the portions of Tso relied upon to reject claims 8, 10 and 24 is a different embodiment. However, each portions of Tso relied upon in rejecting these claims are the embodiment illustrated with respect to figure 5.

Applicant again argues (see page 17) that Engel relates to a protocol selection and that the claimed invention relates to a system handling multiple streams. However, as discussed above, Engel teaches a Real Time Parser (RTP) which is “a collection of routines which perform protocol parsing” (see column 19 lines 53-54). It is clear that Engel teaches a protocol parser and this parser has various routines for “parsing the different protocols at the various layers” (see column 20 lines 1-3) many of these protocols are implemented at levels above the transport layer (see column 20 lines 4-28). Therefore, Engel teaches “a protocol parser capable of discriminating among different protocols implemented on top of the transport layer”. And with respect to this argument it is noted that streams are not claimed; although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant's argument (see bottom of page 18) that Tso and Engel fail to teach the claimed invention is moot in view of the above response.

With respect to Applicant's argument (see page 19) that the Corliss reference is unrelated to Tso and Engel and does not supply any reason or motivation; each of the identified references teach that communication of information over a network therefore it

would be obvious to substitute the data transferred in the modified Tso and Engel system with the SMS messages of Corliss. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, motivation, as recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art, to do so would have been to monitor SMS messages.

With respect to Applicant's argument (see page 19) that the Corliss reference was issued after Applicant's filing date and therefore cannot be used to render the claimed invention obvious, Applicant is directed to MPEP section 706: "(4) Subject matter which is developed by another person which qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) may be used as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103 against a claimed invention unless the entire rights to the subject matter and the claimed invention were commonly owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person at the time the claimed invention was made." In this situation Corliss has an earlier filing date than the present invention and has a different inventive entity therefore qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) which in turn qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Applicant's argument (see top of page 20) that Tso and Engel fail to teach the claimed invention is moot in view of the above response.

With respect to Applicant's argument (see page 20) that Johnson fail discloses the use of files rather than a communication stream it is noted that streams are not claimed; although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, Johnson teaches decrypting data and when combined with the modified Tso and Engel system teaches decrypting instant messaging or peer-to-peer code that is being communicated through a communications channel.

Applicant's argument (see pages 20-21) with respect to Elgamal is moot in view of the above response.

Applicant's argument (see top of page 22) that Tso and Engel fail to teach the claimed invention is moot in view of the above response.

With respect to Applicant's argument (see page 22) that Elgamal does not disclose using encryption in a communications stream which is intercepted it is noted that streams are not claimed; although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, Elgamal is merely relied upon for the teaching of SSL encryption and when combined with the modified Tso, Engel and Johnson system the claimed limitations of SSL communications.

Applicant's arguments (see pages 23-25) with respect to the Double Patenting rejections are moot in view of the above response.

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOCHA whose telephone number is (571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2437

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael Pyzocha/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437